

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 18, 2010.

I. Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Wang for the courtesy of a telephone interview between Examiner Wang and Kuiran (TED) Liu (#60,039) on April 14, 2010. During the telephone interview, a proposed amendment on independent claim 1 was discussed. No agreement was reached during the interview.

II. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed February 18, 2010, Claims 1, 3, 7-14, 16, 20-25, 52-62 were pending in the Application. Claims 1, 3, 7-14, 16, 20-25, 52-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0033535) in view of Fichtner (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0005297).

III. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 7, 13, 20, 23, 52, 55, 60, cancels Claims 12, 25, 54, 57-58 and 61-62, and adds new Claims 63-65, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 3, 7-11, 13-14, 16, 20-24, 52-53, 55-56, 60, and 63-65. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed February 18, 2010, Claims 1, 3-5, 7-14, 16-18, 20-25, 51-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of Fichtner.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

1. *(Currently Amended) A system for single security administration comprising:
a first application server of a transactional server type, which is configured to execute transaction processes including receiving transactional procedure calls from clients to initiate the transaction processes, wherein the first application server includes
an access control list which defines user security information for use in authorizing the calls from clients, and
a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) authentication server*

plugin which is configured to forward the transactional procedure calls from clients to another application server for authorization;
a second application server of a non-transactional server type, which is configured to administer security for the first application server, wherein the second application server includes
a user profile database which includes security information for a plurality of users, including for each of the users a mapping of security credentials for that user between the transactional server type and the non-transactional server type, and
an embedded LDAP server which is configured to receive and process the transactional procedure calls from the LDAP authentication server plugin; and wherein, when a transactional procedure call to initiate a transaction is received from a client at the first application server, the LDAP authentication server plugin identifies the user associated with the transactional procedure call, determines that the second application server should authenticate the user,
initiates an LDAP session between the first application server and the second application server, and
forward the transactional procedure call to the embedded LDAP server, wherein, upon receiving the transactional procedure call from the LDAP authentication server plugin, the embedded LDAP server processes the transactional procedure call, determines a corresponding user information from the user profile database, and
returns the corresponding user information to the LDAP authentication server plugin,
and wherein, after receiving from the embedded LDAP server a corresponding user information as determined by the user profile database at the second application server, the LDAP authentication server plugin
creates a token reflecting an authentication result based on the corresponding user information, which is subsequently used to authenticate the client to participate in the transaction.

Fisher discloses a common authentication protocol or proxy (CAP) server which includes an authentication interface that communicates with directory service authentication backends. (Paragraph [0019]). As further disclosed at Paragraph [0023], Fisher describes that the CAP server obtains the user or user group information from an external source.

However, there is no indication in Fisher that the CAP server can receive a transactional procedure call to initiate a transaction, and forward the transactional procedure call to an authentication backend. Also there is no indication in Fisher that the authentication backends can receive and process such a transactional procedure call to initiate a transaction.

Fichtner discloses that "a main focus of the present invention is to provide a database server with the capability of performing a Web single-sign-on to various backend HTTP servers. In order for this feature to be enabled, resource credential mapping capability is used to provide

this goal. Essentially, a resource credential may be used to store a user's identity and password for signing on a particular backend HTTP server. ... Resource ... data objects ... may allow an administrator to map a specific application's user identification and password to one or more multiple backend HTTP servers that require basic authentication sign-on credentials. ... Authentication server will be based on the location of the web resource requested to find the URAF_ResCreds associated with the user, and provide the contents of UID and AuthnData to the backend HTTP server. As a result, the authentication server signs onto backend server on behalf of the user. " (Figure 9, Paragraph [0054]).

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no indication in Fichtner that a transactional procedure call to initiate a transaction can be forwarded from a transactional server to a non-transactional server, and a embedded LDAP server in the non-transactional server can receive and process the transactional procedure call and provide authentication information.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 and 60

The comments provided above with regard to Claim 1 are herein incorporated by reference. Claims 13 and 60 have been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 13 and 60, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 7-11, 14, 16-18, 20-24, 52-53 and 55-56

Claims 3, 7-11, 14, 16-18, 20-24, 52-53 and 55-56 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1 and 13 are not addressed in detail herein. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Additional Amendments

Claims 63-65 have been newly added by the present Reply. Applicant respectfully requests that new Claims 63-65 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 19, 2010

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928